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----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

We thank the editors and reviewers for conducting the peer-review of our manuscript. In the revised version, we have fully addressed the reviewers’ comments. All changes with respect to the original submission have been highlighted in red in the revised manuscript. The provided comments have helped to improve the technical contents as well as the presentation of our work.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

EIC: First, I apologize for the horrible delay in getting this decision to you.  Your submission was plagued by an inability to find reviewers, tardy reviewers, and a tardy associate editor.   This shouldn't happen, and I apologize.   Regarding the paper itself, the reviewers are consistent in the issues they raise.  They feel there could be a contribution in your work, but it's not clear with respect to prior work.

**Response:** Thank you very much for providing us a fair review with many useful comments. Based on your recommendation, we have performed a major revision to address all concerns raised by the three respectable reviewers. Specifically, several additional experiments and comparisons have been added to the revised paper. We have fully addressed the reviewers’ comments. All changes with respect to the original submission have been highlighted in red in the revised manuscript.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Reviewer's Comments to Author：**

**Reviewer: 1**

**Recommendation:** Revise & Resubmit (paper requires more than a minor revision)

**Comments:**  
(There are no comments. Please check to see if comments were included as a file attachment with this e-mail or as an attachment in your Author Center.)  
  
**Additional Questions:**  
1. Confidence in your review: Low  
  
2. What is the important insight or idea that this paper contributes?: Comparison of generalized pipeline array using QCA.

3. What is the potential impact of this paper?: Comparison with previous results.  
  
4. Is the manuscript technically sound?  Please explain your answer in  
the "revisions" or "comments for the authors" sections below.: Appears to be – but didn’t check completely  
  
5. What revisions do you suggest for the paper?:

**Comment 1-1:**The author should clearly explain how they have come up with the design given in  Figure 5. Figure 5 is not mentioned in the text at all.

**Response:**

**Comment 1-2:**Equations 1, 3 and others are given in reference 9. I fail to understand why authors do not describe their papers by building on reference 9 rather than building on reference 8.

**Response:**

6. Other comments for the authors:

**Comment 1-3:**The authors should start their papers by giving a review of reference 9 and then illustrate and prove how they have made modifications in reference 9.

**Response:**

**Reviewer: 2**  
**Recommendation:** Revise & Resubmit (paper requires more than a minor revision)  
  
**Comments:**  
(There are no comments. Please check to see if comments were included as a file attachment with this e-mail or as an attachment in your Author Center.)  
  
**Additional Questions:**  
1. Confidence in your review: High  
  
2. What is the important insight or idea that this paper contributes?: This paper proposed a new method for efficient hardware implementation of quantum-dot cellular automata.  
  
3. What is the potential impact of this paper?: Minor improvement on the existing QCA implementation  
  
4. Is the manuscript technically sound?  Please explain your answer in  
the "revisions" or "comments for the authors" sections below.: Appears to be – but didn’t check completely  
  
5. What revisions do you suggest for the paper?:

This paper proposed a new method for efficient hardware implementation of quantum-dot cellular automata. I have the following comments regarding the paper:

**Response:**

**Comment 2-1:** Although the topic looks interesting, I am not sure how much contribution this paper adds to the state-of-the-art. In other words, the paper came up with different hardware implementation for the work proposed in reference [9].

**Response:**

**Comment 2-2:** As the authors mentioned the new hardware implementation resulted in higher area efficiency and lower latency. If QCA is the way the future technology is going to go, we need more innovations to push this technology into the market.

**Response:**

**Comment 2-3:** The paper lacks architectural innovation. I believe the proposed method needs to be combined with some innovation in the hardware to show the actual benefit. The reported improvements are coming from the gate-level implementation, rather than architecture.

**Response:**  
  
My suggestion to authors is to also focus on architecture level to show the actual benefit.

**Response:**

6. Other comments for the authors:  
  
**Reviewer: 3**  
**Recommendation:** Minor Revision  
  
**Comments:**(There are no comments. Please check to see if comments were included as a file attachment with this e-mail or as an attachment in your Author Center.)  
  
**Additional Questions:**  
1. Confidence in your review: Medium  
  
2. What is the important insight or idea that this paper contributes?: This paper highlights prior work in design of quantum-dot cellular automata (QCA) including the publication of a generalized piplined cellular array (GPCA) cell. The authors identify inefficiencies in the circuit design of the arithmetic unit and control unit of the GPCA design and propose a new design that leads to a reduction in area and critical path latency by 39.27% and 35.89% respectively.

3. What is the potential impact of this paper?: This paper could lead to more efficient implementations of QCAs and is a clear advancement over existing state-of-the-art. It is unclear to me the future impact of QCAs in general, but the work is well described and the improvement is impressive.

4. Is the manuscript technically sound?  Please explain your answer in  
the "revisions" or "comments for the authors" sections below.: Yes  
  
5. What revisions do you suggest for the paper?

**Comment 3-1:** It would be nice to better highlight the downsides of prior work. I felt section 2.1 ended abruptly without describing the issues with these gate counts.

**Response:**

**Comment 3-2:**A brief discussion/overview of the wire-crossing problem would be nice. I understand at a very high level from VLSI that wire-crossings are difficult but are they \*more\* difficult for QCA design and layout? If so, briefly explain why and give a sense for how painful it is. That will help readers understand how important your contribution is.

**Response:**

**Comment 3-3:**It’s difficult in text to understand the trade-offs between different design choices. For example, following all of the changes in various gate counts of page 2 is tedious for the reader. Putting these numbers into a table or using relative numbers when comparing all design choices of each expression would be helpful.

**Response:**

**Comment 3-4:**It would also be nice to have some sort of progressive information to show a “path” to your final design through the various design points you evaluated.

**Response:**

6. Other comments for the authors:

**Comment 3-5:**There is plenty of white space and text for you to compress to add more to the paper. For example. The right column of the first page is very sparse, and the text below section 2 could be completely deleted if that space is useful to add more figures or explanatory text. X

**Response:**

**Comment 3-6:**Figure 5 is very large and for me did not add much value to the paper. Is it to show that there are few wire crossings? Is there any way to shrink it without making it unreadable? Or maybe consider removing it? (although it is a pretty figure!)

**Response:**

**Comment 3-7:**Instead of using a citation as a noun (i.e. “We compare against [9]” or “[9] used 4 gates”) you should really use the proper name for the technique and then cite it. I think GPCA[9] would be clearer. This makes Table 1 especially difficult to parse on first read.

**Response:**